

LUC-463/Barclay 12-10-6-9

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1-13 and 16-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-13 and 16-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,266,514 issued to O'Donnell on July 24, 2001.

Applicants have avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Applicants' claim 1, as amended, now recites,

"a network component that employs one or more call characteristics to make a determination to initiate a request for one or more positions of one or more mobile stations;

wherein the network component receives, in response to the request, the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations from a position component; and

wherein the position component determines the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations continuously".

O'Donnell does not teach this limitation. Instead, O'Donnell discloses a technique for mapping areas of poor coverage in a cellular network. O'Donnell uses a mobile station's position update information and a radio quality measurement to determine the adequacy of coverage in a cellular network. When a quality measurement surpasses any of one or more specified thresholds, O'Donnell determines the geographical location from which the measurement was transmitted, as stated in column 5, lines 45-49. In effect, O'Donnell determines the location of the mobile station only after the threshold has been surpassed. Furthermore, O'Donnell's technique suppresses positioning reports from trouble areas that have already reported, as stated in column 5, lines 56-59.

By contrast, applicants' position component responds to a request from the network component, and determines the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations continuously, as required by applicants' claim 1. Thus, O'Donnell is

LUC-463/Barclay 12-10-6-9

missing the "component determines the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations continuously" element, as stated in applicants' claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that O'Donnell does not describe each and every element of claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is not anticipated by O'Donnell. Since claims 2-13 and 16-17 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over O'Donnell.

Independent claim 18 has a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by O'Donnell. For example, claim 18 recites, "initiating a request for one or more positions of one or more mobile stations through employment of one or more call characteristics; receiving, in response to the request, the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations; and determining the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations continuously". O'Donnell does not teach these limitations for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claim 18 is likewise allowable over O'Donnell. Since claims 19-21 depend from claim 18, these dependent claims are also allowable over O'Donnell.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Donnell in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 20050119013 issued to Jeong et al. on June 2, 2005.

Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection.

This rejection is based on the rejection under U.S.C. § 102(b) being proper. As that ground of rejection has been overcome, and none of the cited references teach or suggest "wherein the network component receives, in response to the request, the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations from a position component; and wherein the position component determines the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations continuously", as recited in applicants' independent claim 1, the combination of O'Donnell with Jeong does not supply this missing element. Thus, this combination does not make obvious any of applicants' claims, all of which require the aforesaid limitations.

LUC-463/Barclay 12-10-6-9

New Claim

New claim 22 has been added. Claim 22 includes a limitation directed to the time needed to determine the position of the mobile stations. No new matter has been added.

Claim Amendments

Claim 3 was amended to add the term "and" to a limitation. Claims 7 and 16 were amended to provide proper antecedent basis.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, he is invited to call applicants' attorney so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Carmen B. Patti
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: January 20, 2006

Carmen B. Patti & Associates, LLC
Customer Number 47382